There's always been a great problem about the Normal Level and
the process of determining the Normal Level. There's 32 or 33 different
ways that have been gone into to try to develop the most effective
way of getting this. I happen to be as satisfied now as I think
I'll ever be in the manner of getting it, but to give a little bit of
background in relationship to this, the original work which had to do
with interpreting the scatter on the Wechsler, and again this was
the WB-1 which was done more or less under the name of Rabafore and
for the work that was done at Menninger's clinic. They made the
determination that because a person's language or vocabulary ability
need'nt be the one things that is most likely to be less impaired
by anything that happens to an individual over a period of time.
The original idea that the best single estimate in the test of what
a person's general productivity level was or what his intelligence
level was, ax was his performance on the vocabulary subtest. Experi-
ence with this over a period of time I'm beginning to have some doubts
on this progress____(?) within an American community, certainly in
the relationships of psychological assessments with our attention
entirely upon a foreign population, the use of a vocabulary and some
kind of way of getting a measure of vocabulary in other cultures
resulted over a period of time in a sense that the PAS completely
eliminates the vocabulary as one of the tests that go into the PAS
formulation. That then leaves us in the process of trying to find
out something about what the person's IQ level is, IQ level is one

way to put it, or something in terms of a person's potential. My choice of terms over a period of time was normal level. Essentially wha5 I mean by normal level was sort of the best estimate that you can make on the basis of the test score of what a person's general potential is. I think that it is certainly clear that people have different definite levels of capacity over a period of time. There are some people that are smarter than others, if you want to use that type of term, or potentially smarter than others. Now one of the things in relationship to anything that goes into the process of determining a normal leve, if you think of PAS dynamic terms, there are several kinds of intelligence. People can be intelligent in different ways. In general most of the conceptualization of intelligence carry with it much more of an idea of a person's ideational capacity. For example, you talk to a European in terms of a difference between a smart person and a dumb person, the smart person is the one who has a lot of information. It's much more an ideational kind of smartness, than it is anything else. Yet in every society, xhxxxxixxxxxxxxxxxxx there is a tendency or a need somewhere along the line to differentiate between a person who is smart and a person who is shrewd. There are a lot of people who can be very shrewd and not be very smart, playing with words in relationship to this. Consequently, the PAS in one way begins to give a certain amount of knowledge in relationship to the kind of intelligence that an individual has. For example, because I grew up in a period of time in which I was very much influenced by the systemization that Ex Tichner performed in terms of this, in which he would talk about ideational responses and

perceptual responses." And in a sort of a crude way the bright perceptual
izer is really an externalizer, in the sense that his ability to see,

respond, react and do a certain amount of things on the basis of feel,

that this is a perceptually dominant type of an intellectual activity.

And as one of the primary dynamic forces in the PAS that I've talked

about repeatedly, is in the sense that an individual who is committed

too much to what now I'm calling perceptual fragments has a certain

amount of need to control their tendency to operate a little bit too

much by feel, too much by visual relationship, by blocking that out, by

moving into a direction of developing a certain amount of ideational

discipline or ideational strength. And the ideationally dominant in-

dividual has got to learn how to apply a great deal more effort, in a

sense, in developing a perceptual type of relationship. If you come

back to use something like the WAIS or the Wechsler, the Wechsler, one

of the reasons it is pretty good or is very good in the sense of coming

close to giving a person's PAS formula, is that the test is divided in

a sense into a group of subtests part of which are ideational in nature,

part of which are perceptual or mechanical. The original Wechsler is

divided into the verbal subtest and the performance subtest. And the

original Wechsler also gives two kinds of IQ's, one that they call a

verbal IQ and a second, the performance IQ, and then the two together

called a full-scale IQ, which is a sort of a recognition of the fact

that intelligence can have different kind of components to it.

The PAS normal level begins to enter into this a little bit differently

because some of the things, for example, the Digit Span, which is a test

originally designed to be a verbal test, really has some complications
00354
in terms of this. It doesn't pick up verbal intelligence in anything

like/ as, for example, an obvious face-valid type test as the information

on the basis of which you are picking up a person's ability to remember

over a period of time a lot of intellectually or in a sense intellectually

oriented items, and the Block Design which is primarily a performance

test in terms of the way that it's defined begins to give a little bit

more information of a different kind of a thing in relationship to how

a person learns and responds. So consequently, the normal level and the

normal level as it is indicated in terms of this results from what is in

a sense the belief, empirically derived, that is experience over a period

of time, that the three best tests to give some kind of idea of the

initial response state. The three best tests that begin to give some

kind of an indication in terms of this are the Digit Span, the Block

Design, and the Picture Arrangement. The ones which are called primitive

in relationship to this. Therefore a person doing quite well on any

of these three tests, doing quite well on any of these three tests, is

likely to be very clearly a function of his general intellectual poten-

tial. On the other hand, because of the nature of the way that the

tests indicate or the tests operate in the fact that low scores are not

in and of themselves necessarily indicative of low intelligence, the

lowest scores on these tests are indications that a person is lacking

in intelligence. An IRA individual in the PAS, at the primitive state,

is called an IRA because he's done well on Digit Span, Block Design, and Picture Arrangement. The individual who is called EFU on the test is called EFU because he has not done very well on Digit Span, Block Design, and Picture Arrangement, but has begun to show certain kinds of signs of effectively utilizing whatever the EFU primitive response state is. And therefore the other tests begin to be, you have to take into account something about a person's general innt intellectual potential or the way an individual functions. Technically that means in a sense that if you use just a Wechsler form of getting a person's IQ, an individual who is EFU in PAS terms is going to underachieve on the IQ test, because of the fact that three of the tests have a tendency to be quite a ways down which brings it down. The IRA is likely to over-achieve on the intellectual test, and that therefore you've got to get some kind of an estimate to take into account the overachieving capacities of the IRA individual and the underachieving capacities of the EFU, to come up with what is the best estimate of an individual's general full potential. The whole complicated procedure that is now used in terms of trying to determine a Normal Level is based upon taking into account all of the variety of things that experience over a period of time have indicated ± give the best estimate. Because I operate largely by feel in relationship to this, and have operated by feel over a period of time, it is very easy for me to kid myself, this might be what I'm doing in terms of this. The reason I have to draw a graph of the Wechsler subtest/ is that after looking at it over a period of time, I can look at that and what I can see in effect is the invisible line that goes down the middle which represents the Normal Level. Now it's very

hard to train people over/period of time to be able to look at that

scatter and begin to estimate. I see that invisible line which is in

a sense my clinical judgment based over a period of time, that seeing

enough of these, I think I can make an estimate that is pretty good in

terms of this. So therefore I have had to struggle for a long period

of time to try to find a mechanical system which most effectively picks

up what I'm now calling this invisible line. This creates a certain

amount of problems because people who begin to take the PAS too literally

and begin to work in terms of this are likely to come to me and mechan-

ically a Normal Level has come out as 12 and I say, "That's not a 12

that's a 13 or I will make a correction in interpretation because I'm

still not completely satisfied that the invisible line is there. Plus,

this is what I'm really leading up to in terms of this, is an over-

estimate of the meaning of a difference between a Normal Level 12 and

a Normal Level 13 or a Normal Level 14. If you relax a little bit in

interpreting the formula and not tie it in too much by the mechanical

bit. What I put up here is what I consider the clustering of Normal

Levels. To a certain extent in a general way, it doesn't make an awful

lot of difference whether an individual's normal level is 6, 7, or 8.

We'll start at that particular level in relationship to this. There

is very little intellectual potential between these particular individua

This something that for the purposes of description and to try to put it

in IQ terms in the way that I think about it, is that I would take the

middle one and say that this is about the equivalent of a 70 IQ. And

as a 70 IQ, when you move into the direction where in a person it comes

out 8 in the Normal Level procedure, there is a pretty good chance

that this is a 70 IQ individual who is overachieving a little bit in
relation to that 70. He's not likely to be a clearcut, easy-going
70 IQ. He's going to be operating a little bit above that; if
it comes out 6 in relationship to this, the individual is likely to be
underachieving and is going to look less than the 70. The three
of them all are very much the same in that each time you get 6, 7,
or 8 if you look at them and begin to make your interpretation, you've
got to get a little clinical judgment when you're looking at a PAS
formula when you've got that particular combination. The same thing in
terms of this, an individual is 9, 10 and 11, a cluster in relationship
to this; this is about the equivalent of an IQ of 100. 10 is the 100
IQ, the 11 is the ~~it~~ 100IQ individual/who is beginning to achieve a little
bit above the 100, he's an over-achiever at his normal leve. The nine
is likely to be moving into the direction of going the other way. But
again you have to use a little bit of clinical judgment because there's
not much difference between whether you call a person an 11 or you call
him a 9, you think of him in that particular relationship. The same
thing in ~~kem~~ terms if you move up, you get the next cluster of 12,
13, and 14. A Normal Level of 13, this is what we call an IQ of
about 120 which is probably not 130. Again this is a good, solid,
above average IQ level and it makes very little difference whether the
person is 12, 13 or 14, except it's more likely that the 14 individual
is achieving above a 13 Normal Level, a 12 is achieving below that
because of the way you derive the Normal Level.

The same thing when you get in the upper limits, that the higher IQ's the upper group it makes very little difference whether a person is 15, 16, or 17. It's likely to be a best estimated in terms of knowing what a 16 is. And thinking of this, 17 is being a kind of overachievement and 15 as moving a little bit in the direction of an underachiever. I can show in relationship to the distribution scores, as we begin to get enough of them over a period of time that you're getting in effect what is the Normal usual curve distribution of these particular scores, with the balance of the people beginning to come in here, with something like this as 10%. I don't have the real standards of deviations to do this on, I'm doing this clinically. (This is 10%, this is 10%, this is 20%. etc.) In terms of what we get primarily in our sample in relationship to this is we're getting fairly heavily loaded in people who are 12 13 and 14 because of the nature of the populations that we're dealing with. I could show you my hospital population which comes from a different one in terms of this, and you'll begin to find a higher number beginning to fall in what is in the sense 9, 10, 11. Also because of the way the PAS formula is derived, the PAS formula is going to likely be much more accurate when you're dealing with anyone in this particular level, and is beginning to fall off in terms of a certain amount of accuracy when you begin to get any that are moving up in this particular area. Because there are a variety of things that begin to happen in the test performance that begin to distort and disturb. And as a matter of fact, if I have a Normal Level of 13, rather relatively easily derived from a Wechsler test or a 10 in terms of this, I feel very comfortable

about interpreting this. Once you begin to get 15, 16, 17, 6, 7, or 8,
it takes a lot more clinical knowledge, clinical judgment and a lot of
00359
other things to try to begin to make the PAS formulation as accurate as
derived from the test. Now what does all this mean? That first in
relationship to this is 9, 10, and 11. You can have an individual who i:
9, 10, and 11 E or 9, 10, 11 I, or 12, 13, 14, E, or 12, 13, 14 I. Now
this begins to get complicated, because to a certain extent, the fact th:
this particular group of individuals has a certain amount of capacity
to do certain kinds of I activities, an E individual at these particular
levels might be able to do better than the I people in this. In other
words the I individual up here, just because he's I does not automaticall
                                        E
make him smarter than the/individual at this particular level down here.
So you begin to have to take something into account in relationship to
this, including that for example, a 9, 10, 11 I individual to a certain
extent is likely where, if he overachieves or if he learns to achieve
in any particular way, he is likely to overachieve by using his I
orientation to be able to learn certain kinds of ideational skills in
a rote way. I mean, if you make an individual 9, 10, 11 IR and you
expose him to a series of intellectual kakx tasks which call for rote
learning, the fact that that individual is IR is likely to mean that th:
individual in this particular group will overachieve on the task that
he's being asked to perform in an intellectual way, because he's learne
it in a rote way. But you've got to be very careful because the fact
that he has learned it very well does not really mean that he is as
intelligent as his capacity to rote learn certain types of IR activitie

The same thing in relation to this a 9, 10, 11 individual, make him EF,

00369

the EF at 9, 10 or 11 at this particular level may when exposed to IR

tak tasks have a tendency to very definitely underachieve in IR tasks,

and therefore is likely to do very poorly in a sense in school type of

activities. On the other hand, if the 9, 10 or 11 individual really

works very hadd to learn he might because he has worked very hard to

do IR activities, you can have a Normal Level 10 EF individual who is

brighter because he has worked harder to understand what he's learning

than is an IR individual who has learned something by rote and has not
                                        other
understood it. On the/h and, the EF individual in most cases when given

certain kinds of intellectual tasks, is going to underachieve on that.

And I can guarantee you that anywhere along the line if you've got a 12,

13, 14 individual the minute that an EFU or any EF individual is put in

a situation on the basis of which he has to take what is essentially an

ideational oriented type of activity, one of the first things that the

EF individual is going to say is either "I can't do it," or "I don't

believe in the test." One of the things is that a certain kind of

healthy EF oftentimes works very hard and is likely to be effective in

terms of developing ideational discipline somewhere along the line. But

anytime theykkx take IQ tests, they're likely to end up with what they

would consider an underestimate. Now MENSA, they're made up almost

entirely of E's who are extremely proud of the fact that they have been

able to beat a test. And they're likely to be ER's and there can be

IR's. Occasionally there will be a very proud EF because, what do they

claim, they say you've got to have an IQ of over 130 or 148 xk or

whatever it is. And part of the idea is that they can have meetings

together and because they're all so bright ... it certainly as an EF and

I'm being very hostile about it as an EF, to me it is one of the stupidest

things thatI can think of because the people who are involved

in it are very interested in it. It's a difference in terms of orien-

tation, but the general idea at the IR level, particularly high normal

level IR, who begin to ritualize certain kinds of intellectual activi-

ties, and particularly ER's who have a feeling that they have developed

very much their intellectual activities. An ER is likely to join MENS A

because they can demonstrate how smart they are by going through the

discipline of learning intellectual tasks. An IR individual is more

likely to join one of these health clubs on the basis of which they

begin to be very proud of how well they have disciplined and learned

to organize his relationship to developing their feel, their perceptuali-

zation, their ability to control and discipline themselves. In terms

of this an IR is likely to have the feeling, that one of the primary

things ฉ a person should learn in school as an IR, because of their

IR orientation, there should be lots of organized sports, calisthenics,

and that the idea that you start anywhere along the line that you

begin with calisthenics there is an absolute necessity that you learn

the discipline of how to be active because this is what the IR or the

IF individual is likely to do. There is hardly a healthy IR or IF

individual, and particularly the IF individuals who are not extremely

preoccupied with the process of developing their visual-motor mechanical

skill. And the thing that I've said repeatedly in terms of this, an

IF individual is likely to be nuts about tennis or handball or squash

because these are the calisthenics, the disciplining of beginning to learn how to discipline their IR tendency into something that is outside. Now the ER's or the EF's are much more like to be concerned with, ER's particularly at one period in time, the thing that they were very much concerned with was that people take Latin in school. Why? Because Latin was an intellectual discipline and the ER or the EF who learned how to do Latin developed a mental calisthenic, which is somewhat similar to the physical calisthenics that I was just talking about in the other direction. Mathematics, an indication of the capacity to be, arithmetic and learning your multiplication tables, all of the traditional methods which were essentially the development of intellectual discipline of a calisthenic nature on the basis of which you develop the kind of skill to effectively overcome what is in a sense your weakness. An Ic individual is likely to have a very strong sense of responsibility because one of the things that Ic means is that the individual has gone from being too self-sufficient, too withdrawn into a direction of being more responsible, more appropriately independent. Now an Ic because he is responsible, if he has an Iu one of the things that the Ic-Iu relationship is likely to perpetuate, the Iu as it were, because the Ic is going to be so responsible for the Iu, that the Iu is never placed under any particular pressure in the direction that ......

Uc, this is an individual who has a strong sense of need of appropriateness, of social appropriateness, a considerable amount of need to try to make sure that other people learn social appropriateness. Therefore a Uc responsible for a U is going to work

awfully hard at developing the appropriateness of the U and be over-
confident when he sees..... (tape 23 - 2nd side seems to have no

further recording.)